



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/616,194	07/14/2000	Danke Mahesh Bhaskar	TI-28043	3909

23494 7590 09/29/2006

TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED
P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999
DALLAS, TX 75265

EXAMINER

BRINICH, STEPHEN M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2625

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

09/16/194

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---------------------------------------------------	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT

PAPER

20060921

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/616,194

Applicant(s)

BHASKAR, DANKE MAHESH

Examiner

Stephen M. Brinich

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 5, 6, 8 and 9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 5 and 6 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8 and 9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2625

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 8 recites (lines 1-2) "an opcode having two boundary checks" and later (line 10) recites "means for removing said boundary checks". Similarly, claim 9 recites (line 2) "an opcode having two boundary checks" and later (line 10) recites "removing said boundary checks". In each case, the claim recites a system in which an opcode initially has two boundary checks and in which these checks are later removed.

The present Specification describes as background art (page 3, lines 3-5) a system having boundary checks:

Art Unit: 2625

The core loop of the opcode should have two boundary checks for the index to avoid accessing outside the lookup table area. These checks introduce additional instructions and hence increases the time taken for rendering one pixel.

The present Specification then describes (page 4, lines 3-6) Applicant's invention as having these boundary checks (in the core loop) "removed":

In accordance with one embodiment of the present invention for a given opcode table, maximum and minimum values of index are determined and the lookup table is "expanded in both directions to take care of these maximum and minimum values and the checks in the core loop are removed, reducing the total rendering clock count.

However, these two descriptions refer to two different implementations: the Prior Art implementation in which these boundary checks are present and the Applicant's implementation in which they are absent. Note Applicant's description (page 7, line 16 - page 8, line 4) of these checks being implemented in the Prior Art. Note also Applicant's reference to the checks being "removed" (page 8, line 8) in describing the process as illustrated in Figure 2 (which clearly does not indicate the presence of the removal of this check as a step in Applicant's invention).

Art Unit: 2625

In this context, the references to these checks being "removed" (page 4, lines 5-6; page 8, line 8) clearly refers to a difference between the two implementations (the Prior Art implementation and Applicant's implementation), and not to a step implemented in the means or method of Applicant's implementation. The latter is required to provide an enabling disclosure for the recitations of claims 8-9.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 5-6 are allowed.

4. Claims 8-9, insofar as they are understood, would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Re claims 5-6, as noted previously (4/19/06 Office action, paragraph 4), Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 5 (Response filed 9/19/05: page 5, line 19 - page 6, line 2) and claim 6 (Response filed 4/11/05: page 9, lines 1-8) have been fully considered and are persuasive.

Re claims 8-9, the art of record does not teach or suggest the recited arrangement of removing an initially provided

Art Unit: 2625

boundary checks in conjunction with the recited arrangement of look-up table index determination and expansion.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 6/13/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues (6/13/06 Remarks: page 5, line 5 - page 7, line 8, particularly page 7, lines 1-8) that the recited boundary check removal is supported by the descriptions in the Specification (page 4; page 8, line 8) to the removal of the core loop.

However, as described in paragraph 2 supra, these descriptions refer to a distinction between two different embodiments, not to a step of removal (or means for executing such a step) that occurs in Applicant's invention.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS

Art Unit: 2625

of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning the contents of this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen M. Brinich at 571-272-7430.

Any inquiry relating to the status of this application or proceeding or any inquiry of a general nature concerning application processing should be directed to the Tech Center 2600 Customer Service center at 571-272-2600 or to the USPTO Contact Center at 800-786-9199 or 571-272-1000.

The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays 8:00-5:30, alternate Fridays off.

The examiner's unit designation has been changed from "Art Unit 2624" to "Technology Division 2625" (as of March 20, 2006).

If attempts to contact the examiner and the Customer Service Center are unsuccessful, supervisor David Moore can be contacted at 571-272-7437.

Art Unit: 2625

Faxes pertaining to this application should be directed to the Tech Center 2600 official fax number, which is 571-273-8300 (as of July 15, 2005).

Hand-carried correspondence may be delivered to the Customer Service Window, located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314.

Stephen M Brinich
Examiner
Technology Division 2625

smb *SMB*
September 21, 2006



THOMAS D.
~~TERRY~~ LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER